



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,248	09/29/2003	Monika Henzinger	0026-0043	8702
44989	7590	01/18/2007	EXAMINER	
HARRITY SNYDER, LLP 11350 Random Hills Road SUITE 600 FAIRFAX, VA 22030			RUTLEDGE, AMELIA L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/18/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/672,248	HENZINGER ET AL.	
	Examiner Amelia Rutledge	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/27/2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8, 10, 12-21, 23-26 and 28-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8, 10, 12-21, 23-26 and 28-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed 10/27/2006.
2. Claims 1-8, 10, 12-21, 23-26, and 28-30 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 10, 15, 21, and 26 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-8, 10, 12-21, 23-26, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galai et al. (hereinafter “Galai”), PCT Application filed August 2002, International Publication Number WO 03/017023 A2, published February 2003, in view of DaCosta et al. (hereinafter “DaCosta”), U.S. Patent No. 6,665,658, issued December 2003.**

Independent claim 1 cites: A method for crawling documents comprising:

receiving a uniform resource locator (URL);

receiving at least two different copies of a document associated with the URL;

and determining whether a web site corresponding to the URL uses session identifiers based on a comparison of URLs that are within the document and that change between the at least two different copies of the document, where the web site is determined to

use session identifiers when a portion of the URLs that change between the at least two different copies of the document is greater than a threshold.

Galai teaches a method of indexing dynamic web pages for a search engine. The search engine consists of a spider and repository (p. 4, l. 3-19). Galai teaches a method for normalizing the URL of a document to index substantially similar Web pages only once (p. 20, l. 10-20). Galai teaches comparing a Web page with a second retrieved web page with reduced parameters, i.e., any divisible subunit of the URL (p. 20, l. 10-20). Galai teaches the comparison of URLs within the document where the Web page includes one or more links with the complete URL, as for a sessionID (p. 20, l. 21-p. 21, l. 9), resulting in two web pages which are similar in content but not identical. Galai teaches detecting the change between the two different copies of the document (p. 21, l. 1-8; p. 27, l. 14-p. 28, l. 21).

Galai teaches comparing a portion of the URLs that change between the two copies of the document and determining similarity based on a predetermined value of the portion of the URLs that change (p. 27, l. 6- p. 28, l. 21; especially p. 28, l. 11-21), since Galai teaches automatically determining the redundant parameter of the URL comparisons of divisible subunits of the URL and then using that parameter, or URL portion, as a basis of comparison to other URLs. Galai teaches determining a similarity level which is the likelihood of two web pages to have the same content, and if this value exceeds a certain threshold, then the URL portion, i.e., the subunit of the URL, is determined to be redundant (p. 27, l. 6-22; Fig. 5). Galai teaches using the threshold to determine similarity between URLs for purposes of crawling and indexing a web page

for a search engine (p. 26, l. 19-p. 27, l. 5), and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the same threshold could be used to determine the difference between URLs for web pages, since the difference threshold would have been the inverse or opposite of the similarity threshold number.

While Galai teaches a comparison of URLs for redundant parameters, which would include session identifiers since session identifiers are parameters within a URL, Galai does not explicitly teach that the URLs are compared for the specific purpose of determining whether the web site uses session identifiers. However, DaCosta teaches a method for crawling documents in a dynamic website, with a database for storing and identifying session identifiers URLs, and an application program for controlling a software agent (Col. 4, l. 41-Col. 5, l. 23). DaCosta teaches the analysis of URLs and headers containing cookie data to determine if a web site uses session IDs (Col. 6, l. 21-40). It was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that session data for a web site and/or document could be contained in either the URL string, or in a cookie.

Both DaCosta and Galai are directed toward methods for crawling web documents and tracking state and session information for web documents. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of indexing web pages for a search engine by removing redundant pages by comparing URL parameters taught by Galai, with the means of identifying session identifiers by comparing URL data and cookie data taught by DaCosta, so that Galai would have the benefit of identifying session information for a web site whether

the session information were contained in the URL string or in the cookie, in order to remove redundant pages from both configurations (URL string or cookie) of dynamic web sites.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Galai teaches that the method of comparing URLs can be applied to any web page in a site (p. 4, l. 15-20).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Galai teaches a method of normalizing the URL in order to index substantially similar web pages only once (p. 20, l. 10-23); i.e., *comparison of the clean, or normalized URL to a set of clean URLs that represent previously crawled URLs*; since Galai teaches a process for detecting redundant parameters in URLs with the same structure, executed once per URL structure, and then applied and executed for application to each URL with the same structure (p. 21, l.21-p. 22, l. 5).

Regarding dependent claims 4-6, Galai teaches that the method of comparing URLs can be applied to any web page in a site (p. 4, l. 15-20). Galai teaches an automatic method of URL comparison to remove redundant parameters from pages (p. 20, l. 10-20), which would include session IDs (p. 20, l. 21-23), where the rules are determined automatically by comparing the URLs for redundancy and normalizing them.

Regarding dependent claim 7, Galai teaches a process for detecting redundant parameters in URLs with the same structure, executed once per URL structure, and then applied and executed for application to each URL with the same structure (p. 21, l.21-p. 22, l. 5), compare to *receiving the URL as a URL from a previously crawled web document*.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Galai teaches crawling the URL when the URL is determined to not already have been crawled (p. 24, l. 9-15).

Independent claim 10 cites: *A method for identifying web sites that use session identifiers comprising: downloading at least two different copies of at least one document from a web site; extracting uniform resource locators (URLs) from the two different copies of the web document; comparing the extracted URLs of the two different copies of the document; and determining whether the web site uses session identifiers when the comparison indicates that at least a portion of the URLs change between the two different copies.*

Galai teaches a method of indexing dynamic web pages for a search engine. The search engine consists of a spider and repository (p. 4, l. 3-19). Galai teaches a method for normalizing the URL of a document to index substantially similar Web pages only once (p. 20, l. 10-20). Galai teaches comparing a Web page with a second retrieved web page with reduced parameters, i.e., any divisible subunit of the URL (p. 20, l. 10-20). Galai teaches that the web page is retrieved again using the reduced

URL, i.e., downloading at least two different copies of at least one page from a web site. Galai teaches the comparison of URLs within the documents where the Web page includes one or more links with the complete URL, as for a sessionID (p. 20, l. 21-p. 21, l. 9), resulting in two web pages which are similar in content but not identical. Galai teaches detecting the change between the two different copies of the document (p. 21, l. 1-8; p. 27, l. 14-p. 28, l. 21) when the comparison indicates that at least a portion of the URLs change between the two different copies.

Galai teaches comparing a portion of the URLs that change between the two copies of the document and determining similarity based on a predetermined value of the portion of the URLs that change (p. 27, l. 6- p. 28, l. 21; especially p. 28, l. 11-21), since Galai teaches automatically determining the redundant parameter by URL comparison and then using that parameter as a basis of comparison to other URLs.

While Galai teaches a comparison of URLs for redundant parameters, which would include session identifiers since session identifiers are parameters within a URL, Galai does not explicitly teach that the URLs are compared for the specific purpose of determining whether the web site uses session identifiers. However, DaCosta teaches a method for crawling documents in a dynamic website, with a database for storing and identifying session identifiers URLs, and an application program for controlling a software agent (Col. 4, l. 41-Col. 5, l. 23). DaCosta teaches the analysis of URLs and headers containing cookie data to determine if a web site uses session IDs (Col. 6, l. 21-40). It was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that session

data for a web site and/or document could be contained in either the URL string, or in a cookie.

Both DaCosta and Galai are directed toward methods for crawling web documents and tracking state and session information for web documents. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of indexing web pages for a search engine by removing redundant pages by comparing URL parameters taught by Galai, with the means of identifying session identifiers by comparing URL data and cookie data taught by DaCosta, so that Galai would have the benefit of identifying session information for a web site whether the session information were contained in the URL string or in the cookie, in order to remove redundant pages from both configurations (URL string or cookie) of dynamic web sites.

Regarding dependent claim 12, Galai teaches that the method of comparing URLs can be applied to any web page in a site (p. 4, l. 15-20).

Regarding dependent claim 13, claim 13 reflects substantially similar subject matter as claimed in dependent claim 2, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 14, Galai teaches an automatic method of URL comparison to remove redundant parameters from pages (p. 20, l. 10-20), which would

include session IDs (p. 20, l. 21-23), where the rules are generated automatically by the method of comparing the URLs for redundancy and normalizing them.

Independent claim 15 cites: *A device comprising: a spider component configured to crawl web documents associated with at least one web site; and a session identifier component configured to determine whether the web site uses session identifiers based on a comparison of a portion of uniform resource locators (URLS) that change between different copies of at least one web document downloaded from the web site.*

Galai teaches a method of indexing dynamic web pages for a search engine. The search engine consists of a spider and repository (p. 4, l. 3-19). Galai teaches a method for normalizing the URL of a document to index substantially similar Web pages only once (p. 20, l. 10-20). Galai teaches comparing a Web page with a second retrieved web page with reduced parameters, i.e., any divisible subunit of the URL (p. 20, l. 10-20). Galai teaches the comparison of URLs within the document where the Web page includes one or more links with the complete URL, as for a sessionID (p. 20, l. 21-p. 21, l. 9), resulting in two web pages which are similar in content but not identical. Galai teaches detecting the change between the two different copies of the document (p. 21, l. 1-8; p. 27, l. 14-p. 28, l. 21).

While Galai teaches a comparison of URLs for redundant parameters, which would include session identifiers since session identifiers are parameters within a URL, Galai does not explicitly teach that the URLs are compared for the specific purpose of

determining whether the web site uses session identifiers. However, DaCosta teaches a method for crawling documents in a dynamic website, with a database for storing and identifying session identifiers URLs, and an application program for controlling a software agent (Col. 4, l. 41-Col. 5, l. 23). DaCosta teaches the analysis of URLs and headers containing cookie data to determine if a web site uses session IDs (Col. 6, l. 21-40). It was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that session data for a web site and/or document could be contained in either the URL string, or in a cookie.

Both DaCosta and Galai are directed toward methods for crawling web documents and tracking state and session information for web documents. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of indexing web pages for a search engine by removing redundant pages by comparing URL parameters taught by Galai, with the means of identifying session identifiers by comparing URL data and cookie data taught by DaCosta, so that Galai would have the benefit of identifying session information for a web site whether the session information were contained in the URL string or in the cookie, in order to remove redundant pages from both configurations (URL string or cookie) of dynamic web sites.

Regarding dependent claim 16-17, Galai teaches a spider to download content from a network and a component of the autonomous software search program to extract URLs from the downloaded content (p. 26, l. 19-p. 27, l. 5) compare to *fetch component*

configured to download content from a network; and a content manager configured to extract URLs from the downloaded content.

Regarding dependent claim 18, claim 18 reflects substantially similar subject matter as claimed in dependent claim 2, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 19, Galai teaches that the method of comparing URLs can be applied to any web page in a site (p. 4, l. 15-20).

Regarding dependent claim 20, Galai teaches an automatic method of URL comparison to remove redundant parameters from pages (p. 20, l. 10-20), which would include session IDs (p. 20, l. 21-23), where the rules are generated automatically by comparing the URLs for redundancy and normalizing them.

Regarding independent claim 21, claim 21 is directed toward the device used for implementing the method as claimed in claim 10, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 23, claim 23 reflects substantially similar subject matter as claimed in dependent claim 12, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 24, claim 24 reflects substantially similar subject matter as claimed in dependent claim 2, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 25, claim 25 reflects substantially similar subject matter as claimed in dependent claim 14, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 26, claim 26 is directed toward the computer-readable medium containing programming instruction for executing the method as claimed in claim 10, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 28, claim 28 reflects substantially similar subject matter as claimed in dependent claim 12, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 29, claim 29 reflects substantially similar subject matter as claimed in dependent claim 2, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 30, claim 30 reflects substantially similar subject matter as claimed in dependent claim 14, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 10/27/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's arguments in regard to claim 1, in which

applicant argues that Galai discloses determining whether the parameter used to reduce, or normalize, the URL is redundant based on a comparison of two *web pages* and thus does not teach the limitations of claim 1 (Remarks, p. 10-11), the examiner respectfully disagrees. Claim 1 recites determining whether a web site corresponding to a URL uses session identifiers based on a comparison of URLs that are *within the document and that change between the at least two different copies of the document* (Claim 1, emphasis added). Therefore it appears that claim 1 also recites a comparison of links *within two web pages*. Galai teaches that "lack of identity may occur if the web page includes one or more links with the complete URL, as for a session ID." (Galai, p. 27, l. 14-16). Therefore Galai does teach retrieving and comparing both URLs for the Web page itself, as well as comparing URLs, the links *within the document*, to determine page similarity for the purpose of search engine indexing.

6. While applicant argues that Galai discloses comparing web pages in content and visual similarity (Remarks, p. 12-13), it is the examiner's opinion that although Galai teaches these additional methods of comparison, Galai also explicitly teaches determining similarity between web pages by using the comparison of URLs for and within the page, and the relevant portions of Galai have been cited for the rejections of claim 1. The additional and separate features of the invention disclosed in the reference and argued by applicant were not relied upon for the rejections of claim 1.

7. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually (p. 13-14), one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413,

208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In this case, applicant does not address the DeCosta reference in the Remarks, but appears to focus solely on Galai. It is the examiner's opinion that the combination of Galai in view of DeCosta renders the claimed invention obvious.

In regard to applicant's arguments addressed to independent claims 10 and 15, and the remaining independent claims (Remarks, p. 15-18), applicant's arguments follow a rationale similar to the arguments regarding the rejections of claim 1.

Applicants argue in regard to claim 15, for example, that Galai does not disclose the session identifier component recited in claim 15, which compares a portion of URLs that change between different copies of at least one web document downloaded from the web site (Remarks, p. 17). However, Galai does teach comparing a Web page with a second retrieved web page with reduced parameters, i.e., any divisible subunit of the URL (p. 20, l. 10-20). A divisible subunit of the URL represents a portion of URLs that change between different copies, since Galai teaches the comparison of URLs within the document where the Web page includes one or more links with the complete URL, as for a session ID (p. 20, l. 21-p. 21, l. 9), resulting in two web pages which are similar in content but not identical. Galai teaches detecting the change between the two different copies of the document (p. 21, l. 1-8; p. 27, l. 14-p. 28, l. 21).

For these reasons and the reasons of record, the rejections of the remaining independent and dependent claims should be maintained.

The previous Office Action mailed 05/18/2006 stated that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that session data for a web site and/or

document could be contained in either the URL string, or in a cookie (p. 4, l. 6-8). The statement of official notice was not traversed in the response filed 10/27/2006, therefore the common knowledge or well-known in the art statement is taken to be admitted prior art because applicant did not traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice in the response (MPEP 2144.03 C).

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amelia Rutledge whose telephone number is 571-272-7508. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:30 - 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AR



Doug Hutton
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100